

Analytic Inversion of Emission Lines of Arbitrary Optical Depth for the Structure of Supernova Ejecta

R. Ignace^{1,2} & M. A. Hendry^{3,4}

ABSTRACT

We derive a method for inverting emission line profiles formed in supernova ejecta. The derivation assumes spherical symmetry and homologous expansion (i.e., $v(r) \propto r$), is analytic, and even takes account of occultation by a pseudo-photosphere. Previous inversion methods have been developed which are restricted to optically thin lines, but the particular case of homologous expansion permits an analytic result for lines of *arbitrary* optical depth. In fact, we show that the quantity that is generically retrieved is the run of line intensity I_λ with radius in the ejecta. This result is quite general, and so could be applied to resonance lines, recombination lines, etc. As a specific example, we show how to derive the run of (Sobolev) optical depth τ_λ with radius in the case of a pure resonance scattering emission line.

Subject headings: Line Profiles – Radiative Transfer – Techniques: spectroscopic – Supernovae: general – Stars: mass-loss – Novae

1. INTRODUCTION

For many years analysis of the spectra of various types of supernovae has been a highly active area of research, with relevance to studies of nucleosynthesis and galactic chemical evolution, stellar winds and the interstellar medium, and the extragalactic distance scale (c.f., Chevalier 1990; Eastman, Schmidt, & Kirshner 1996; Filippenko 1997; Branch 1998). Fast numerical codes (c.f., Fisher 1999) now exist to “forward” model synthetic spectra – which can then be matched to observed spectra – from a parametrized treatment of the temperature, velocity, density and composition structure of supernova ejecta (c.f., Millard et al. 1999). On the other hand, there has been comparatively little study of the *inverse* approach, to infer the radial dependence of intrinsic physical characteristics of the ejecta directly from spectral line profiles. Fransson & Chevalier (1989) and Fransson (1994) investigate the use of optically thin line profile shapes as a diagnostic of the emissivity with radius for supernova ejecta in homologous expansion (i.e., $v(r) \propto r$). However, we realized that an analytic inversion for emission lines of arbitrary optical depth could be derived.

As described in this paper, our inversion relies on the fact that the emission from a geometrically thin shell with an expansion speed that is linear in radius will produce a rectangular or “flat-topped” emission profile (such a profile shape is more commonly associated with optically thin lines formed in constant expansion shells). After undertaking this study, we discovered a comment by Kuhl (1973) who discussed flat-topped emission lines observed in the spectra of Wolf-Rayet stars. Appearing in a “Note added in proof”, Kuhl credits C. Magnan for pointing out that an optically thick spherical shell with $v \propto r$ can also produce a flat-topped profile. Unfortunately, no reference to the remark is given, nor have we been able to locate any similar conclusions in other published works.

¹ Email: ri@astro.physics.uiowa.edu

² 203 Van Allen Hall, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242 USA

³ Email: martin@astro.gla.ac.uk

⁴ Department of Physics and Astronomy, Kelvin Building, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ, Scotland UK

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a derivation of the inversion technique, beginning first with a discussion of Sobolev theory in Section 2.1, then a derivation of the basic inversion in 2.2, followed by a discussion of occultation effects in 2.3, and ending with an illustrative application to a pure resonance scattering line in 2.4. A discussion of the method and caveats to practical applications are given in Section 3.

2. THE LINE INVERSION

We consider ejecta from a supernova as existing in a spherical shell in homologous expansion with inner radius $r_{\min}$ and outer radius $r_{\max}$. There may or may not be a pseudo-photosphere existing in this shell (a pseudo-photosphere will exist at early times following the supernova, but fade toward late times). Allowing for a pseudo-photosphere, we define r_{ph} as its radius. Given these assumptions, we show how to derive information about the radial structure of the ejecta, in terms of density, ionization structure, heating input, and so on, or some combination thereof from the inversion of an observed emission line profile. This inversion is applicable to lines of *arbitrary optical depth*. The formalism follows arguments developed by Brown et al. (1997) and Ignace et al. (1998) for the inversion of optically thin emission lines formed in stellar winds. Whereas those authors were seeking to derive the wind speed distribution for a known stellar mass loss rate, here we can assume a speed distribution $v(r) \propto r$ and thus solve for other properties in the ejecta shell.

2.1. Sobolev Theory

We employ standard Sobolev theory (Sobolev 1960; Mihalas 1978; Lamers & Cassinelli 1999). A small parcel of gas at radius r from the center of the supernova (taken to be the origin) and expanding radially with $v(r)$ will produce line emission with a Doppler shift given by $\Delta\lambda = \lambda_0 \frac{v(r)}{c} \cos\theta$, where θ is the spherical polar angle between the sightline (taken to be the z -axis) and the line from the origin to the gas parcel. For convenience, we use $\mu = \cos\theta$ hereafter and also introduce the line-of-sight velocity shift $v_z = v(r)\mu$.

Sobolev theory provides the following expressions for the radiative transfer in a spherical expanding envelope. The flux is given by

$$F_\lambda(\Delta\lambda) = \frac{1}{D^2} \int_{\Delta\lambda} 2\pi I_\lambda p dp, \quad (1)$$

where p is the impact parameter orthogonal to the z -axis, D the distance, I_λ the monochromatic line intensity, and the integration proceeds over the isovelocity zone specified by $\Delta\lambda$ a constant. We assume a velocity law of the form $v(r) = v_{\max}(r/r_{\max})$, where $v_{\max}$ is the maximum speed obtained by the shell located at largest radius $r_{\max}$. The locus of points of constant Doppler shift $\Delta\lambda = \lambda_0 v_z/c$ is given by $v_z = v_{\max} \mu (r/r_{\max}) = v_{\max} (z/r_{\max})$. This means that isovelocity zones are planes oriented orthogonally to the observer's line-of-sight. Because the ejecta resides in a shell of finite extent, these zones are disks or annuli that cut through the shell. (Annuli occur when the disk cuts through the shell for $z < r_{\min}$ or $z < r_{\text{ph}}$, thereby intersecting either the inner evacuated region of the shell or the pseudo-photosphere.)

The intensity from Sobolev theory is $I_\lambda = S_\lambda (1 - e^{-\tau_\lambda})$, where the source function S_λ and the Sobolev optical depth τ_λ are evaluated at the point of consideration. The optical depth is given by

$$\tau_\lambda(p) = \frac{\kappa_\lambda(r) \rho(r) \nu_0}{|dv_z/dz|}, \quad (2)$$

where $\kappa_\lambda(r)$ is the line opacity, $\rho(r)$ the mass density in the shell, and dv_z/dz is the line-of-sight velocity gradient. For a spherical flow, this velocity gradient is

$$\frac{dv_z}{dz} = \mu^2 \frac{dv}{dr} + (1 - \mu^2) \frac{v}{r}. \quad (3)$$

Using the preceding expressions from Sobolev theory, we next formulate the line inversion technique.

2.2. The Basic Inversion Result

It is important to recall the well-known result that a constant expansion shell producing optically thin line emission will have a flat-topped profile shape. Such a line will have emission spread between velocity shifts $v_z = +v(r)$ and $v_z = -v(r)$. For an optically thin line formed in a shell with a range of radial speeds, one can construct the line profile as a superposition of flat-tops, each arising from a sub-shell expanding at constant speed. The different flat-top emission contributions have width in wavelength as determined by the speed of the sub-shell and emission height determined by its volume and emissivity. The inversion methods derived by Brown et al. (1997) and Ignace et al. (1998) are based on this kind of construction. Differentiating the emission profile, their technique is to use the observed Doppler shift to trace out the physical velocity in the flow, so that the profile slope essentially yields information on the run of density (or more generally the emissivity) with radius. They show that for a given emissivity, one can invert the emission profile to yield $v(r)$.

For arbitrary optical depths, the contribution from each shell is not generally flat-topped, thus one cannot usually employ this inversion. However, the case of linear or homologous expansion is a special case, with each shell producing a flat-topped emission contribution for arbitrary optical depth (as we next show), and hence an inversion is still possible. Consider equation (3) for the velocity gradient. In the case of linear expansion, the gradient reduces to $dv_z/dz = \mu^2 (v_{\max}/r_{\max}) + (1 - \mu^2) (v_{\max}/r_{\max}) = v_{\max}/r_{\max}$. This is constant, meaning that the Sobolev optical depth $\tau_\lambda = \tau_\lambda(r)$ is a function of radius only. Scattering or production of photons in a flow with a velocity gradient will normally be anisotropic, but the case of homologous expansion is special, yielding an optical depth that is isotropic. In the language of Sobolev theory, this means that the escape probability is likewise isotropic. Since the source function is a function of radius, the intensity is consequently a function of radius too, with $I_\lambda(r) = S_\lambda(r) [1 - e^{-\tau_\lambda(r)}]$.

Now consider a geometrically thin spherical shell undergoing homologous expansion. The flux of line emission will be $F_\lambda(\Delta\lambda) = (2\pi/D^2) I_\lambda(r) p dr$. The isovelocity zones are rings oriented with constant z . However, we also have the geometric relation that $r^2 = p^2 + z^2$, and since $z = \text{constant}$ at fixed $\Delta\lambda$, we find that $r dr = p dp$. Thus the flux becomes $F_\lambda(\Delta\lambda) = (2\pi/D^2) I_\lambda(r) r dr$. The result is that the flux appearing at any $\Delta\lambda$ is a function of radius only, hence the flux at all $\Delta\lambda$ in the line profile is the same – a flat-topped emission profile, even though we have nowhere required the line to be optically thin.

Extending this to a shell of arbitrary extent with a linear velocity law as specified, we have the total flux at Doppler shift $\Delta\lambda$ being

$$F_\lambda(\Delta\lambda) = \frac{2\pi}{D^2} \int_{r(v)}^{r_{\max}} I_\lambda(r) r dr. \quad (4)$$

Making a change of coordinate from r to v , with $dr = dv/(dv/dr)$, we obtain

$$F_\lambda(\Delta\lambda) = \frac{2\pi}{D^2} \int_v^{v_{\max}} I_\lambda(r(v)) r(v) \frac{dv}{dv/dr}. \quad (5)$$

Differentiating with respect to $\Delta\lambda$ and noting that $d\lambda = d(\Delta\lambda)$ and $dv/dr = v_{\max}/r_{\max} \equiv t_0^{-1}$, we find that

$$\left(\frac{dF_\lambda}{d\lambda}\right)_{\Delta\lambda} = -\frac{2\pi t_0}{D^2} r I_\lambda(r) \left(\frac{dv}{d\lambda}\right)_{\Delta\lambda} = -\frac{2\pi c t_0}{\lambda_0 D^2} r I_\lambda(r), \quad (6)$$

where t_0 is the age of the supernova ejecta shell at the time of the line measurement, and the derivatives are evaluated at the point in the line profile where $\Delta\lambda = \lambda_0 v(r)/c$. The minus sign signifies that the profile gradient $dF_\lambda/d\lambda < 0$ (i.e., emission increases from the wings toward line center). The lefthand side is the data, and so we can directly solve for the intensity on the righthand side.

2.3. Occultation Effects

We have so far ignored the pseudo-photosphere, which can influence our results by way of line absorption and geometric occultation. As is standard for P Cygni profiles, the column of material intervening between the photosphere and the observer will scatter or absorb photospheric light. Since this column of gas is moving toward the observer, the absorption will appear as blueshifted from line center. As a consequence, the blueshifted part of the profile consists of the emission part superposed on the absorption trough. The net result is a distorted profile shape, which may be in absorption or emission. The resolution to this difficulty is simply to apply our inversion to the redshifted part of the profile only.

However, geometric occultation modifies the shape of the redshifted profile by virtue of blocking out line emission from the receding column of gas on the far side of the photosphere. If we can approximate the photosphere as a spherical ball of infinite optical depth, we can correct for the occultation as follows (e.g., see Ignace et al. 1998). Even with occultation, the emission from a shell still produces a flat-top profile, except that the emission at greatest redshift is no longer observed. The maximum redshift for emission from a shell of radius r no longer extends to $v(r)$ but rather $\tilde{v}(r) = v(r) \sqrt{1 - r_{\text{ph}}^2/r^2}$, purely from considerations of geometry. So $\tilde{v}(r)$ is the redshift of gas where the shell of radius r intersects the occultation tube that extends behind the pseudo-photosphere. As expected, a shell very near the photosphere will be almost entirely occulted, for which $\tilde{v} \approx 0$, whereas a shell of radius $r \gg r_{\text{ph}}$ will suffer little occultation and thus $\tilde{v} \approx v$.

Substituting $\tilde{v}$ for v and applying the inversion to equation (4) for the flux of line emission in the redshifted profile, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{dF_\lambda}{d\lambda}\right)_{\Delta\lambda=\lambda_0 \tilde{v}/c} = -\frac{2\pi c t_0}{\lambda_0 D^2} r I_\lambda(r) \sqrt{1 - \frac{r_{\text{ph}}^2}{r^2}}, \quad (7)$$

where we have substituted for $d\tilde{v}/dr = (\tilde{v}/r)(1 - r_{\text{ph}}^2/r^2)^{-1}$. To simplify the expression, we define a normalized emission profile gradient as $\Phi(\Delta\lambda) = (\lambda_0/F_{\lambda,c})(dF_\lambda/d\lambda)$, where the continuum flux is $F_{\lambda,c} = \pi I_{\text{ph}} r_{\text{ph}}^2/D^2$. Solving for the intensity, we get

$$\frac{I_\lambda(r)}{I_{\text{ph}}} = \frac{-\Phi(\Delta\lambda) r_{\text{ph}}^2}{2c t_0 r} \left(1 - \frac{r_{\text{ph}}^2}{r^2}\right)^{-1/2} \quad (8)$$

where the line profile gradient is evaluated at $\Delta\lambda = \lambda_0 \tilde{v}(r)/c$.

2.4. Application to a Pure Resonance Scattering Line

As an example, we consider homologous expansion and a pure resonance scattering line. A major simplification occurring in this case is that the source function reduces to the form $S(r) = W(r) I_{\text{ph}}$, for the dilution factor $W(r) = 0.5 \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - r_{\text{ph}}^2/r^2}\right)$ (e.g., Mihalas 1978). In this case the intensity becomes $I_{\lambda}(r) = W(r) I_{\text{ph}} (1 - e^{-\tau_{\lambda}})$, and our inversion equation (8) can be used to obtain the line optical depth, viz

$$\tau_{\lambda}(r) = -\ln \left\{ 1 - \frac{r_{\text{ph}}^2}{2c t_0 r} \cdot \frac{[-\Phi(r)]}{[1 - 2W(r)] W(r)} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

This technique is an extremely powerful diagnostic, *if* both spherical symmetry and homologous expansion may be assumed. For example, the optical depth depends on opacity and density associated with the ion and transition being considered. Depending on what is known or can be assumed, the inversion of the line profile can provide constraints for the mass spectrum of the ejecta, ionization and/or excitation of the ion, heating from radioactive decay, or some combination of these properties (e.g., see Fransson & Chevalier 1989 for similar considerations in the context of their analysis for optically thin lines). It is important to stress that the inversion is model independent (proviso the assumptions) and so can be used to test current models for supernova explosions. The applicability of the inversion requires monotonicity in the velocity field, but the derived optical depth structure itself need not be monotonic. Any such non-monotonicity might for example be a signature of changes in the ionization of the ion producing the line emission, or perhaps non-monotonicity in the mass spectrum.

3. DISCUSSION

We have shown that emission line profiles of arbitrary optical depth formed in supernova ejecta shells can be analytically inverted to yield information about the shell structure. The method even allows for geometric occultation by a pseudo-photosphere. However, there are a few important checks and caveats that should be noted.

- a) It is key that the method be applied only to emission lines that are “pristine” (i.e., not blended with other lines), otherwise the profile shape will be affected, perhaps severely, and the inversion will yield a result, but it won’t be physically meaningful.
- b) We argued that one should apply the inversion to the redshifted profile only, because absorption on the blueshifted half of the line would render the inversion technique invalid. However, having obtained, for example, the optical depth structure from the redshifted profile, one could use that information to forward model the blueshifted profile. This would provide a check for self-consistency. Failure to recover the observed blueshifted profile would imply that either the shell is not spherically symmetric or the expansion is not homologous.
- c) The emission profile should show a flat-top at line core. This flat-top would correspond to the emission from the inner most observable shell, either at the radius r_{min} with radial speed v_{min} , or effectively just outside the pseudo-photosphere r_{ph} with radial speed v_{ph} . However, it may be that the central flat-top could be narrow and difficult to resolve spectroscopically, or even perhaps that thermal or turbulent broadening causes the it to be somewhat more “rounded” than flat. In this case the inversion will artificially tend to yield a result for radii interior to either r_{min} or r_{ph} , as the case may be. A resolution of this problem is to make use of the *total* line emission of the redshifted wing. One would take the results from the inversion, integrate in radius, and compare with the observed

line emission. The radius at which the integration matches the total observed line emission should be $r_{\min}$ or r_{ph} , as appropriate, and thus where the results from the inversion should be truncated.

- d) Finally, we wish to point out that at certain times, especially early times, electron scattering might significantly alter the line profile shape (e.g., Fransson & Chevalier 1989). Electron scattering will lead to a broadening of the emission line, but in such a way as to conserve total line flux. This will alter the profile shape, and hence bias application of our inversion. Essentially, the expectation is for the profile to be broadened and the slope to be diminished. The recovered intensity will then be reduced relative to what it would be in the absence of electron scattering.

In conclusion, our inversion technique is a fairly general method for obtaining structure information about supernova ejecta shells; however, care must be exercised in the line selection and consideration given to the time t_0 since the explosion, since this latter quantity is relevant for the prominence of a pseudo-photosphere and the significance of electron scattering broadening. Under favorable conditions, our method should provide important constraints for hydrodynamic and radiative transfer models of supernova explosions, and possibly in novae if the required conditions are met.

The authors gratefully acknowledge helpful discussions with Profs. John Brown, Joe Cassinelli, Jay Gallagher, Ken Gayley, and Bob Mutel. We also thank an anonymous referee. MAH acknowledges support for this research from a PPARC grant. RI acknowledges funding support from an NSF grant (AST-9986915).

REFERENCES

- Branch D. 1998, ARAA, 36, 17
- Brown, J. C., Richardson, L. L., Cassinelli, J. P., & Ignace, R. 1997, A&A, 325, 677
- Chevalier, R. A. 1990, in Supernovae, ed. A.G. Petschek (Berlin: Springer), 91
- Eastman, R. G., Schmidt, B. P., & Kirshner, R. P. 1996, ApJ, 466, 911
- Fillipenko, A. V. 1997, ARAA, 35, 309
- Fisher, A. 1999, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. Oklahoma
- Fransson, C., & Chevalier, R. A. 1989, ApJ, 343, 323
- Fransson, C. 1994, in Supernovae, ed. S. A. Bludman, R. Mochkovitch, & J. Zinn-Justin (Amsterdam: Elsevier), 677
- Ignace, R., Brown, J. C., Richardson, L. L., & Cassinelli, J. P. 1998, A&A, 330, 253
- Kuhi, L. V. 1973, ApJ 180, 523
- Lamers, H. J. G. L. M., & Cassinelli, J. P. 1999, Introduction to Stellar Winds (London: Cambridge Univ. Press)
- Mihalas, D. 1978, Stellar Atmospheres (New York: W. H. Freeman)
- Millard, J., Branch, D., Baron, E., Hatano, K., Fisher, A., et al. 1999, ApJ, 527, 746
- Sobolev, V. 1960, Moving Envelopes of Stars (Cambridge MA: Harvard Univ. Press)